

REMARKS

Claims 1-16, 18-35 are pending in this Application with Claim 1 being amended. Claims 1, 2 and 9 have been rejected with Claims 3-8, 10-16 objected to, Claims 18, 19 withdrawn and Claims 20-35 allowed. No new matter is added by way of these amendments, and the amendments are supported throughout the Specification and the drawings. Reconsideration of Claims 1-16 is respectfully requested.

The Applicant incorporates by reference the previous arguments made in the Applicant's previous responses to Office Actions. The Applicant further states that none of the prior art references teach the features as claimed in independent Claim 1.


In response to the Interview Summary dated June 22, 2006, the Applicant states that independent Claim 1 was discussed to determine language that the Examiner agreed defined over the prior art of the record. The Examiner proposed adding "for providing simultaneous spray cooling and dry cooling for a plurality of electronic cards" to the preamble for the purpose of identifying the general purpose of the claimed invention which the Applicant accepted. The Examiner further proposed adding "wherein said spray chamber is sealed" which the Applicant accepted with the understanding that the spray chamber may obviously include a door or other access device to provide access to the interior of the spray chamber. The Examiner proposed adding "wherein said at least one dry electronic card is a low-medium heat flux card with reduced cooling requirements and generates relatively lower amounts of heat during operation thereof compared to said at least one wet electronic card" which the Applicant accepted. The Examiner proposed placing the word "liquid" in front of coolant to clarify that at least a portion of the fluid emitted from the spray unit was liquid and not solely a gas which the Applicant accepted.

The Examiner proposed adding "a dry cool system within said dry chamber for applying airflow to said at least one dry electronic card positioned in said dry chamber" which the

Applicant did not accept. It was agreed that removing the word "within" and replacing it with the phrase "fluidly connected to" was acceptable since there was no requirement that the dry cooling system be completely or partially within the dry chamber and also it included all possible dry cooling systems such as a fan or a vent.

In light of the foregoing amendments and remarks, early reconsideration and allowance of this application are most courteously solicited. Should the Examiner consider necessary or desirable any formal changes anywhere in the specification, claims and/or drawing, then it is respectfully asked that such changes be made by Examiner's Amendment, if the Examiner feels this would facilitate passage of the case to issuance. Alternatively should the Examiner feel that a personal discussion might be helpful in advancing this case to allowance, they are invited to telephone the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael S. Neustel (Reg. No. 41,221)
NEUSTEL LAW OFFICES, Ltd.
2534 South University Drive, Suite No. 4
Fargo, North Dakota 58103

June 30, 2006

Date

Telephone: (701) 281-8822
Facsimile: (701) 237-0544
e-mail: neustel@patent-ideas.com




Attorney's Docket No. ISOT-019

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with proper postage as First Class mail in an envelope addressed to:

Mail Stop AF
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

on June 30, 2006.



Michael S. Neustel

NEUSTEL LAW OFFICES, Ltd.
2534 South University Drive, Suite No. 4
Fargo, North Dakota 58103

Telephone: (701) 281-8822
Facsimile: (701) 237-0544
e-mail: michael@neustel.com